

BLANK ROME LLP
Lawrence C. Hinkle (SBN 180551)
Hinkle-l@blankrome.com
Cheryl S. Chang (SBN 237098)
Chang@blankrome.com
1925 Century Park East, 19th Floor
Los Angeles, Ca 90067
Telephone: 424.239.3400
Facsimile: 424.239.3434

Attorneys for Defendant
Language Services Associates, INC.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LANGUAGE LINE SERVICES, INC., a
Delaware corporation,

Plaintiff,

VS.

LANGUAGE SERVICES ASSOCIATES, LLC, a Pennsylvania corporation; WILLIAM SCHWARTZ, an individual; PATRICK CURTIN, an individual; and DOE DEFENDANTS 1 THROUGH 50,

Defendants.

Case No. CV 10-02605JW

**DECLARATION OF BRIAN T.
WOLFINGER IN SUPPORT OF
DEFENDANT LANGUAGE
SERVICES ASSOCIATES, INC.'S
OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF
LANGUAGE LINE SERVICES,
INC.'S APPLICATION FOR
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

Date: July 12, 2010

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Place: U.S. Courthouse, 280 South
First Street, San Jose, Calif.

First Street, San Jose, C.
Judge: Hon. James Wore

DECLARATION OF BRIAN T. WOLFINGER

1 I, Brian T. Wolfinger, hereby declare as follows:

2 1. I am the Vice President of Digital Forensics and E-Discovery at
3 LDiscovery, a digital forensics, corporate investigations, and electronic discovery firm
4 with offices in the Philadelphia, Chicago, New York City and Washington, DC metro
5 areas. I make this declaration of my personal knowledge and/or my review of the
6 documents cited herein, and could and would testify competently thereto. A true and
7 correct copy of my curriculum vitae is attached as Exhibit A.

8 2. On or about June 22, 2010, the law firm of Blank Rome supplied me with
9 a Complaint in the above-captioned matter dated June 14, 2010, alleging, *inter alia*,
10 that Defendants possess on their computer system certain files and/or data that are the
11 confidential and/or protected property of the Plaintiff. I was also supplied with the
12 Declaration of Anthony J. Merlino, signed June 14, 2010 (the “Declaration”), which
13 recommended a method for examining Defendants’ computer systems as a means of
14 identifying and removing such offending data and files. I examined this Complaint
15 and the Declaration.

16 3. The procedure for data collection and review outlined by Mr. Merlino in
17 the Declaration would be extremely intrusive to the Defendants’ sensitive electronic
18 information. Specifically, a full forensic image (the “clone” described by Mr.
19 Merlino) of the Defendants’ servers and/or computers is overly intrusive and
20 unnecessary, particularly since the goal of the procedure advocated by Plaintiff is to
21 remove any offending data or files in Defendants’ possession by: 1) identifying such
22 data or files; 2) deleting such data or files; and, 3) “wiping” such data or files from the
23 Defendants’ media, i.e. overwriting the “unallocated” areas of the systems in question,
24 where such deleted data or files (and any previously deleted copies) would reside, to
25 Department of Defense standards so as to render all such data or files unrecoverable
26 by any means. These goals can be accomplished completely without duplicating large

1 portions of the Defendants' entire computer architecture –which would mean copying
 2 massive amounts of the Defendants' sensitive information unrelated to the present
 3 litigation – and placing it in the hands of a third party.

4. To identify and/or eliminate any offending active data, rather than follow
 5 the procedure described in Mr. Merlino's Declaration, I would instead recommend the
 6 following procedure, to be conducted by LDiscovery:

- 7 a. LDiscovery would "wipe" (as described above) the unallocated
 space on the drives of all involved Defendant systems, thus
 rendering unrecoverable *any* deleted data – including but not
 limited to the offending data or files - that may have been in
 "unallocated space" on the Defendants' system in a deleted state
 and so conclusively preventing Defendants from accessing any
 offending data or files that may have been previously deleted;
- 14 b. With respect to locating any active data or files, LDiscovery would
 identify the content in question, by file name, extension, MD5 hash
 value¹ or keyword search if necessary;
- 17 c. LDiscovery would first extract detailed metadata listings from all
 of the devices in question, including the MD5 hash values of all
 active files on those systems;
- 20 d. LDiscovery would provide the metadata listings for review and
 search for instances of the offending files (by name or MD5 hash);
- 22 e. LDiscovery would then perform targeted collections of just those
 locations with the Defendants' computer architecture which

24
 1 To amplify the definition provided by Mr. Merlino in his Declaration (page 3, paragraph 6), a "hash" value is an
 2 alphanumeric string assigned to any bounded digital artifact, from a small file to the hard drive of a computer to a server,
 3 by subjecting the digital artifact to a complex algorithm. The result of that computation will be a hash value unique to the
 4 digital artifact. Use of the "MD5" algorithm, perhaps the most popular one, results in an "MD5 hash value." As Mr.
 5 Merlino further makes clear in his Declaration (page 3, paragraph 6), any offending data or files will be readily
 6 identifiable by MD5 hash value and/or keyword searching.

1 contain the data or files in an active state, and then “wipe” (as
2 described above) any remaining offending files.

3 5. The procedure described in this Declaration is much less intrusive and
4 burdensome to the continuation of Defendants' business, less expensive, and quicker
5 than the procedure outlined by Mr. Merlino in his Declaration. It is no less robust a
6 method of identifying and eradicating any offending data or files based on Mr.
7 Merlino's description of the files.

8 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws
9 of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

10 Executed this 23rd day of June, 2010 at 425 Commerce Drive, Suite 125,
11 Fort Washington, PA.

Brian T. Wolfinger